



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,131	12/05/2000	Harold A. Ewing	QMI385/99878A	7857

7590 03/25/2002

Mark G. Kachigian
HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN
228 West 17th Place
Tulsa, OK 74119

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3724	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(1a)

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/730,131	Applicant(s) Ewing et al.
	Examiner Clark F. Dexter	Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims 1-15 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
17) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____	20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claim 1, drawn to system for punching holes, classified in class 83, subclass 360.
 - II. Claims 2-4, drawn to a method system for punching holes, classified in class 83, subclass 13.
 - III. Claims 5-8, drawn to a computer program, classified in class 700.
 - IV. Claims 9 and 10, drawn to an apparatus for punching holes, classified in class 83, subclass 613.
 - V. Claims 11-15, drawn to a punched film, classified in class 156.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Method Group II vs Apparatus Groups I and IV

3. Invention II is related to inventions I and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand; for example, the process can be practiced, at least in part, by hand.

Art Unit: 3724

Method Group II vs Computer Program Group III

4. Inventions of groups II and III are separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of group II does not require the specific details of the code of group III for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group II, and the invention of group III does not require the specific details of the process steps (e.g., determining a hole pattern) of group II for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group III.

Apparatus Groups I and IV vs Computer Program Group III

5. Inventions of groups I and IV are related to the invention of group III as separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of groups I and IV do not require the specific details of the code of group III for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from groups I and IV, and the invention of group III does not require the specific details of the apparatus or system (e.g., the framework) of groups I and IV for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group III.

Apparatus Group I vs Group IV

6. Inventions of group I and group IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, the system of group I could be employed without the specific punching structure (e.g., the solenoid valve) of group IV; and conversely, the

Art Unit: 3724

punching apparatus of group IV could be employed without the specific sensing structure (e.g., the sensing roller) of group I. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Apparatus Groups I and IV vs Product Group V

7. Inventions I and IV are related to invention V as apparatus and product made. The inventions in this relationship are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different apparatus (MPEP § 806.05(g)). In this case, the apparatus as claimed is not an obvious apparatus for making the product and the apparatus can be used for making a different product; for example, the apparatus could be used to punch various types of sheet material.

Method Group II vs Product Group V

8. Inventions II and V are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process; e.g., there are various known processes for punching film.

Art Unit: 3724

Computer Program Group III vs Product Group V

9. Inventions of groups III and V are separate inventions. They are distinct because the invention of group III does not require the specific details of the punched film of group V for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group III, and the invention of group V does not require the specific details of the code of group III for patentability as evidenced by the omission thereof from group V.

10. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Species Election

11. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species Va - .the film of polyethylene composition; and

Species Vb - the film of non-polyethylene composition.

Upon election of Group V, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 11,14 and 15 are generic.

Art Unit: 3724

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

12. A telephone call was made to on to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143):

13. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently

Art Unit: 3724

named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark Dexter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1404. The examiner's typical work schedule is Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, and he can be reached during normal business hours on these days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Allan Shoap, can be reached at (703)308-1082.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148. The fax numbers for this group are: formal papers - (703)305-3579; informal/draft papers - (703)305-9835.



Clark F. Dexter
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3724

cf
March 21, 2002